

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 09 2006

REMARKS

Application No
10/691.018
Examiner
Christopher J Novosad

Applicant
Bodeker Warren Charles
Art Unit
3671

Dear Mr Novosad.

DO NOT
ENTER
CJN
11/27/06

This being Nov. 6 2006 In answer to your Office Action Summery Dated Aug. 17 2006. In your response to my communications filed on 01 February 2006 I find that you referenced Art Unit 3641 That number is incorrect, it should be 3671. I don't know if that played any part in your findings and actions taken?

Sorry for taking so long to respond, as I explained on the phone my wife was diagnosed with stage 4 Cancer and we have been very involved.

In regards to your reply "Office Action Summery" dated August 17, 2006 , page 2, Specifications, "The title of the invention is not descriptive". On 01/22/2004 Robert Eric Pezzuto , billed me an additional \$387 for 9 independent claims over 3, with 12 total claims, then on June 12, 2004 under 35 U.S.C. 112 all 12 claims were rejected, if the claims are not considered why the additional charge?. Then Under "Specification", The title of the Invention is not descriptive. "Weedevader," means you evade Weeds. Then as of 12/09/2004 a final rejection of claims 1-16 and the new name "Cultivator Disk Attachment," were rejected. Then on 01/11/2005, I sent a (RCE) with required fee, and a improperly designated claim. This was followed by a rejection of claim 17 and the new title (Cultivator Disk Attachment) as not descriptive enough. Mr. Pessuto suggested the following title "Tilling and Weeding Device". then on 05/11/2005, I submitted the new name as suggested, along with claim 18. Then on 07/15/2005, You Mr. Novosod sent a non-compliant document, which I understand and have no complaint with. Then I sent a amendment on 08/03/05 and again I was incorrect and received notice